

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The examiner rejects Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 18-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wissinger in view of Carlson. The examiner states that Wissinger teaches a transmitter shown in Fig. 2 comprising a light generating beam for transmitting information the transmitter being pointed in a general direction of a remote receiver, a moveable micromirror, and he refers specifically to element 58 in Fig. 5, in the transmitter and being in a path of the light beam for receiving the light beam to impinge on a photodetector in the remote receiver a beam positioner consisting essentially of a controller and he specifically refers to elements 20 and 39 in Fig. 2, responsive to the position of light in the remote receiver so that the light beam is reflected onto the photodetector and further comprising a control loop and the examiner specifically refers to elements 38 and 39 of Fig. 2, coupled between the controller and the remote receiver for providing a control signal to said controller for controlling the micromirror orientation. The examiner states the Wissinger differs from the claimed invention in that Wissinger fails to specifically teach that the light generated by the source is a collimated light. The examiner states that Carlson from the same field of optical communications teaches the use of collimated light as being well known in the art. The examiner concludes that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to employ collimated light as taught by Carlson in order to eliminate the need for relay elements such as those taught by Wissinger and therefore the present invention would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. First of all, element 58 in Fig. 5 is a prism mirror, and not a micro mirror as it is well known to those skilled in the art. Secondly, and more importantly, Wissinger fails to show or even suggest the utilization of a control loop coupled between the controller and the remote receiver for controlling the orientation of the micromirror. Fig. 2 shows an optical transceiver. The control loop 38, 39 referred to by the examiner is located within the transceiver and receives information along the optical link through receive telescope 30, 32 to control the operation of the gimbal/mirror controller 20 to control the transmit position. It is clear that the receiver portion shown in Fig. 2 is not a remote receiver, but part of the transceiver combination. Accordingly, there is no control loop from the remote transmitter, which is not shown in Fig. 2, to the transceiver, such as the device 10 shown in Fig. 2.

Independent Claim 18 in the present invention recites a control loop which is coupled between the control and remote receiver for providing a control signal to the controller for controlling the micromirror orientation, the control loop being independent of said optical link (emphasis added). The receiver portion of Wissinger makes use of the optical link, and therefore does not show or suggest the utilization of a control loop from the remote receiver to the transceiver shown in Fig. 2 which is independent of that optical link. Accordingly, the examiner's rejection must fail.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

/William B Kempler/
William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
Tel.: (972) 917-5452